

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/460,944	12/14/1999	ERAN SITNIK	PHA23.898 3145	
24737	7590 03/12/2004	EXAMINER		
PHILIPS IN	TELLECTUAL PROP	BUI, KIEU OANH T		
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				D. DED
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	2/
	DATE MAILED: 03/12/2004		4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•••		Applicatio	n No	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary						
		09/460,94	4	SITNIK, ERAN4		
		Examiner		Art Unit		
		KIEU-OAN		2611		
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence address "		
THE - External control	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a ro O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the manned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no ever reply within the statut od will apply and will tute, cause the applic	nt, however, may a reply be tintory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	mely filed  ys will be considered timely.  n the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15	December 20	03.			
· —	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)						
,—						
Disposit	tion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withden claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from con				
Applicat	tion Papers					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.				
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ad	ccepted or b)[	objected to by the	Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be	held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Not	e the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ents have been ents have been riority documer eau (PCT Rule	received. received in Applicat nts have been receive 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage		
Attachmen	nt(s)					
1) 🔯 Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)		
3) 🔲 Infon	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0		Paper No(s)/Mail D			
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date		6)			

Art Unit: 2611

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments of Appeal Brief

1. Applicant's arguments, see the Appeal Brief, filed 12/15/03, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under Hwang and Levin have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hiyoshi (JP10-248020-A) and Clark (U.S. Patent 5,089,885).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiyoshi (JP10-248020-A) in view of Clark (US Patent 5,089,885).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Hiyoshi discloses a television system (Figs. 1 & 2) comprising: a connection configured to be operatively coupled to a connection of an other television (Figs. 1 & 2 as parent's television is coupled to child's television for monitoring purpose, page 5/23, section 0003, and pages 6/23-7/23 sections 0006-0007); and

a processor configured to provide information to the other television requesting information identifying at least one of content and channel currently watched on the other

Art Unit: 2611

television and configured to automatically provide information identifying at least one of content and channel currently watched at said television in response to a request from the other television, i.e., the parent can request to monitor or view the content from any child's television with the parent television control means, and the request information including the content and channel currently watched at the child's television is displaying at the parent's television display (see Figs. 1 & 2/item 16 for parent television control means, and page 5/23, section 0003, and pages 6/23-7/23 sections 0006-0007).

Hiyoshi does not further identify exactly the requests as "query information" and "providing queried information in response to a query request" from the other television; however, the technique of using "a query request" from a user to request for "query information" from another user at the other television is taught by Clark as Clark teaches a monitoring system that a host using a video television system which monitoring a plurality of television users, and based on the user query requests, the queried information can be provided to the users from the host video television system (see Clark, col. 2/lines 45-59 for monitoring concept at remote locations among slave television users, Fig. 8 for queue addressed, and Figs. 18-19, col. 17/line 3 to col. 18/line 62 for details on monitoring process and query processes between the host and the users using a computer routine for requesting and providing queried information). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hiyoshi's television-to-television interactive system with Clark's teaching technique in using query information as means for communicating between televisions whenever a request for that queried information initiated by one of the interactive television users.

Art Unit: 2611

As for claims 2-3 and 8, in view of claim 1 above, the combination of Hiyoshi and Clark further teaches "wherein said connection is configured to provide said query and queried information to the other television", i.e., using the link between the parent television and the child television (as illustrated in Hiyoshi, Figs. 1 & 2 using queried information as taught by Clark) and "wherein said processor is configured to receive query compliance status information identifying if said television is set up to share queried information with the other television", i.e., the status information such as the content of whether is being watching on the child television is shared with the parent television (Hiyoshi, page 5/23, section 0003, and pages 6/23-7/23 sections 0006-0007) with the query information taught as described by Clark earlier.

As for claims 4 and 9, Clark further suggests "wherein said processor is configured to receive identifying information from a user prior to enabling the user to do at least one of set and change query compliance status information", i.e., a validation process is performed before any set and change query compliance status information (Clark, Fig. 18, and col. 17/lines 3-20).

As for claims 5 and 10, the step of "wherein said processor is configured to provide any queried information to the other television that does not violate the query compliance status of the other television" is suggested by Clark as Clark suggests that the command session can be terminated if some query compliance status is not valid (Fig. 8, step 524 then to 526 if a subscriber is not a member; Figs. 9, 10, 19, 20, 22 as some examples for routines checking the validation of query requests between the host and the subscribers).

As for claims 6 and 11, Hiyoshi further discloses "wherein the connection is one of an inhome network connection", i.e., the parent monitors the child's television content within an inhome network (Figs. 1-2, and page 5/23, section 0003, and pages 6/23-7/23 sections 0006-0007), but not "an Internet connection"; however, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well-known in the art that the television system can be easily hooked up to an Internet connection using at least a modem or a cable modem or an internet interface installed within the television

Art Unit: 2611

system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to tone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hiyoshi and Clark's system with a well-known modem or an internet interface in order to connect to the Internet for communicating over the Internet at a remote locations, if preferred, the communication among users not only within a home network but also within a much broader network such as over the Internet.

Regarding claims 12-14 and 16-20, these method claims and system claims with same limitations are rejected for the reasons given with respect to the system claims of 1-11 as already disclosed above.

As for claim 15, Clark further suggests "wherein said identifying is performed by a mediator that is separate from each of said plurality of televisions", i.e., a remote monitoring station acts as a mediator between a host (a service provider) and a slave system such as television users (Fig. 24, and col. 20/lines 10-58).

### Conclusion

4. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 99. 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui Art Unit 2611 March 5, 2004

> KRISTA BUI PATENT EXAMINER